



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

incidents they record, this feature of their narrative, and Vergil's corresponding interest in psychology and causal nexus, are hardly more than a common result of broadly Hellenistic introspection and analysis, as Miss Duckett herself seems to admit on page 51. And if history in the Hellenistic period easily becomes a drama, and the historians delight in dramatic scenes, who shall say whether Vergil's most characteristic quality, his organization of epic narrative into small and large dramatic units, is the result of direct or indirect study of later historians, or whether both the historians and Vergil are under the spell of the older Greek drama, to which certainly the poet is sometimes directly indebted?

In brief, the unity of Miss Duckett's essay and the force of her presentation would have been improved, I think, if the last chapter had been handled in the same way as the earlier chapters, noting the broad indebtedness to Hellenistic spirit and ideas in technique as in other material, and leaving to footnotes the suggestive points of contact with Hellenistic historiography. And this lack of unity is somewhat unpleasantly increased by concluding the essay with scattering notes on rhetorical and metrical details.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*L'Arte Classica.* By PERICLE DUCATI. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1920. Pp. xxiii+965, Figs. 860. 66 Italian lire.

To write a history of classic art in one volume is certainly a *tour de force*—to dwell duly upon certain monuments which are important but unattractive, not to overemphasize one's own special favorites, to bring together knowledge from so many different sources and to co-relate the whole, that is a work requiring the utmost skill and learning. Yet it is a task which the author has accomplished, and he has added a charm of style and generous supply of illustrations which lead the reader on from chapter to chapter of this bulky handbook. It is a work written primarily for Italians, and special stress is therefore laid upon finds and objects of art in Italy.

The author remarks that the marble and fictile figurines from Crete and those from the Cyclades are important as being among the earliest attempts to portray a divinity—a somewhat hazardous conclusion, especially as one of the figurines illustrated is playing the lyre which, taken in conjunction with the frequently found flute players, points rather to “worshippers,” or even to a *genre* subject.

The account of the Minoan palaces and architecture is concisely expressed, although it is classified under the rather misleading title of

"Creto-Mykenean." The wonderful fayence figurines are figured and described, but nothing is said of the remarkable little ivory and gold lady now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (*American Journal of Archaeology*, XIX [1915], 237-49, Pls. X-XVI). A more serious oversight is the lack of reference to the finds in South Russia, where some of the burials have been dated in the third millennium B.C., while others resemble the objects found in the second city of Troy, but are somewhat earlier.

Curiously enough, in the description of the early temples in Sicily there is no word of the Athenaion at Syracuse, a temple which Professor Orsi's recent excavations have shown to be of superlative value for the history of early architecture. In connection with the seated statues of the seventh to fifth centuries B.C. attention should be drawn to the series of figures from Sicily, in local stone or in terra cotta; their great merit consists in the fact that they prove the existence of a flourishing school of local sculptors, to a certain extent substantiating the claims made on their behalf as pupils of Daidalos by ancient writers; moreover in these figures one can trace a rapid artistic and technical evolution, since they ranged from the uncouth, almost amorphous seated female from Grammichele to the exquisite enthroned goddess now in the Berlin Museum.

The early ceramics are clearly differentiated and mention is made of the most important vases. The author wisely refrains from entering into the subtleties of Helladic ware and similar subdivisions; even Boeotian and Cabirian ware are not considered worthy of notice, although some good examples of the latter were found in Sicily.

A page only is devoted to Cypriote art, which might be thought deserving of fuller treatment in consideration of the number and vividness of the portrait statues.

Although there is a brief reference to Exekias, Amasis is entirely ignored and we are given instead an ugly illustration (Fig. 238) of a Panathenaic amphora.

The Ludovisi "throne" is discussed at some length, but nothing is said about its counterpart in Boston. Neither is there any description of that work of the twilight of Greek art, the Demeter of Lycosura of Damophon, not a great artist, perhaps, but deserving of notice as typical of the artistic tendencies of his day. The study of portraiture, too, does not receive its due place; scanty reference is made to the splendid Greek portrait heads, and one is even more sensible of the deficiency when dealing with late Roman works, for at that period it was mainly by the imperial portraits that the artistic torch was still carried on.

But the two branches of art which are most inadequately treated are coins and gems, both valuable sources for our knowledge of ancient art, and both here dismissed with an occasional casual mention to illustrate something else.

There is in Appendix I a chronological history of archaeological finds: one admires the industry and erudition of the author, but one cannot help wishing some of that energy shown in the collection of such material had gone toward amplifying the exceedingly meager bibliography which only enumerates for the help of the student the most obvious works of reference. Our regret is deepened, because we are sure that the author, in order to write a book which is so packed with valuable information gathered from such various sources, must have had an unusually rich bibliography at his fingers' ends.

E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN

ROME

---

*Achilles Tatius.* With an English translation by S. GASELEE.  
 London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's  
 Sons. Loeb Classical Library, 1917. Pp. xvi+461.

The perpetually renewed vicissitudes and surprises of the somewhat trivially melodramatic amours of Leucippe and Clitophon, the disquisitions on the psychology of love, the rhetorical virtuosity of the descriptions of the pictures of Europa, the rhinoceros, the crocodile, the phoenix and the syrinx, the oratory of the murder trial—all this Mr. Gaselee renders into excellent and readable English. His allusions to "photographs" and "churches" will startle some readers, and his persistent designation of the priest of Artemis as the "bishop" recalls the medieval naïveté of Chaucer's.

How that the bishop as the book can telle  
 Amphiorax fell through the ground to helle.

Perhaps he is following the Elizabethan translation by W. B(urton) (London, 1597), of which he owns the only existing copy. He frankly admits that a critical edition of the text has yet to be made. His preface discusses the contributions thereto of the three-column fragment published in volume ten of Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* which antedates all extant manuscripts by a thousand years. In a few doubtful passages he offers hesitatingly suggestions of his own or of a friend. But his usual method of dealing with a corrupt or difficult passage, such as the description of the syrinx, is to say that the Greek is very hard and that he has tried to give the general sense. Apart from such passages the translation is substantially correct and there are very few slips. In ii. 4 ὀκνεῖν δὲ ἐλέγχειν βουλόμενον λαθεῖν is not "I . . . have preferred to seem ignorant." βουλόμενον is the object of ἐλέγχειν. In v. 16. 7 I fear the translator's innocence has been imposed upon. φιλοσοφῆσωμεν ὃ γύναι μέχρις λαβώμεθα γῆς is surely not "Let us continue these arguments, dear lady, until we touch land," but "soyons sage." Greek is almost as tricky as French. In viii. 6. 5 in